DISCUSSING MEANS, ENDS, VALUES, ORGANIZATION, STRATEGY AND MORE[1]

E.P.: I am not very happy to say that but, I have used Google translator to read your "Critique of *Anti-Tech Revolution*"[2]. It has been a long time since I last used it (10 years maybe) but I have to confess it ameliorated considerably, like the other things in so many other areas, unfortunately. I think I was able to understand most of what you are saying. (You can be a better judge on this issue of course.)

U.R.: Even if Google translator (or any other electronic translator) had really improved in the last years (I don't know if it is actually true, but let's assume it), I think, basing on what I know about it, that it is (still?) quite a bad tool for translating and that the resulting translations will likely to be crap most times. If one hasn't available any other and more reliable means to translate, and if one makes quite much effort, maybe one can understand something of what is being translated. But Google translations tend to be terrible and usually do not precisely help to understand a foreign language; rather the opposite. You should remember this all the time when using electronic translators and not to rely much on them for fully and really understanding any text written in a foreign language.

E.P.: I have never heard that three levels classification (infra-structure, structure and super-structure) until I read your criticism. I was familiar with Marx's two levels classification: infra-structure and super-structure. According to Marx, infra-structure is the material base of the society, energy sources, machines that make this energy sources possible and use them in their functioning; relations of production that stem from society's physical relationship with nature and its means of production; the classes and their position in society. Also the know-how, the way production and consumption is organized, techniques that are used to organize machines, human power and the relations between them (e.g., assembly type production, Taylorism, statistical control techniques, etc.); organizational structures (e.g., how companies and institutions are organized, the know-how of most effective organizational structure, etc.). Super-structure is laws, political ideologies, world views, religions, morals, art. As far as I can understand, some of the phenomenons that are under infra-structure in Marxist classification are under the structure in your classification (or Harris's?): classes and positions of these classes in society; know-how and the way the production is organized; organizational techniques; etc. Namely the "technical" aspects as you defined it at footnote 7 of your critique[3].

Does your classification of "technique" and "technology" corresponds to the 3 levels classification of society? "Technology" being the infra-structure and "techniques" being the structure?

---

[1] Adaptation of the correspondence exchange between E.P. and U.R. between October 24 and December 16, in 2018. Original letters were written in English. E.P. is Turkish.

[2] This exchange of correspondence occurred before the English version of "Critique of *Anti-Tech Revolution*" was available.

[3] Footnote 7 of "Critique to *Anti-Tech Revolution*" says: "By 'technology' I mean exclusively the material instruments, tools and products of a culture. The methods or knowledges necessary for doing tasks are 'techniques', not 'technologies'".

U.R.: As I said in the footnote 8 of my critique[4], those are my own definitions or notions of each of the levels. They are not necessarily the same than the definitions or notions of those levels of other materialists, like Karl Marx or Marvin Harris. And indeed they aren't. They are quite similar to Harris', but not always exactly the same. And they are quite different from Marx's. For example, for me "relations of production, the classes and their position in society, the way production and consumption is organized, and organizational structures (e.g., how companies and institutions organize)" are structure, not infra-structure, but the "know-how, techniques that are used to organize machines, human power and the relations between them (e.g., assembly type production, Taylorism, statistical control techniques, etc.)," and the "technical" aspects (techniques) of footnote 7 of my critique, are *super-structure*, not structure, because all of them are actually ideas, theory, information, knowledge, thought; that is non-material and non-relational aspects of society. Certainly, thoughts or beliefs like those can be about structure or infra-structure, but they themselves are neither structure nor infra-structure, because they are neither organizational relationships nor material objects, respectively.

I am going to try to explain this with a simple example: a book about ways of organizing a society. This book (the very object made of paper and ink) is infra-structure and its content (like any other non-material content) is super-structure, though *in this particular case* it is about structure. Any book is always infra-structure (a material object), its content is always super-structure (ideas, information) but it can be about theories (about super-structure), about organizational relationships (about structure) or about material objects (about infra-structure). One should not get the book itself mixed up with its content, nor the content with the subject it is about (the meaning of the content). Likewise, one should not get the techniques (methods, know-how; which are super-structure) mixed up with the goals to they are applied (for example, the organization of the society –structure-, or the production of objects –infra-structure-), nor with the technology -tools- and materials (infra-structure) that are used applying those methods to attain these goals.

Technology for me is just infra-structure (material tools), though it can be used for making other material objects (infra-structure), for organizing (structure) or for storing and transmitting information (super-structure). And techniques are always super-structure, because they simply are methods, i.e., knowledge about how to do things.

E.P: The definition of technology at page 375[5] of *Technological Slavery* encompasses all the elements of, or to say it more correctly crosses through, the three levels of society. Kaczynski is including in his definition the structural elements of techniques (techniques of chemistry, civil engineering, biotechnology) and also super-structural ones (propaganda, educational psychology, ideologies that create consent.)

---

[4] Footnote 8 of the critique said: "These three levels have been proposed by several materialist authors, from Marx to Marvin Harris, with differences in the content of each level depending on the author. What I bring up here is my own way of understanding these levels, which doesn't necessarily match other materialists'. For example, as long as I know, Marx considered economy is just infra-structure; however, though part of economy is in fact infra-structure (means used for extracting, transforming and distributing the matter and energy taken from ecosystems), another great part of it is not infra-structure, but structure or even super-structure (finances, trading transactions, wealth and power distribution, etc.)"

[5] Or page 259 in the Fitch & Madison edition.

U.R.: For me, techniques of chemistry, civil engineering and biotechnology are super-structure not structure. They are knowledge about how to make chemical compounds; about how to build roads, buildings, bridges, dams and the like; and about how to modify genes, respectively, so they are super-structure that is about infra-structure; they are not structure.

E.P.: The conventional revolutionary projects, for example the Marxist one, are not only aiming to destroy the structure and super-structure of society but they are also aiming to create a new society, even a new kind of human being. Their project is to create new relations of production, new institutions, new social relations. I know this is all non-sense and can't be done (history and first chapter of *Anti-Tech Revolution* prove that) but nevertheless, that is their aim. Their job doesn't finish with just destroying the old structure and super-structure but they aim also creating a new society after that. But the revolution proposed by Kaczynski in *Industrial Society and Its Future* and *Anti-Tech Revolution* doesn't have these pretensions. Its aim is fundamentally different. Its sole aim is to destroy the infra-structure. It is not proposing a new social model, some new equal, free and Utopian Eden. Since it is starting with the knowledge that a society cannot be planned beforehand, and more importantly, even if it can be done it would be an abomination to freedom, its mission ends with the elimination of the infra-structure. There is not much to be learned from old revolutionary histories because anti-tech revolution is something totally unprecedented.

I am not arguing that one project is easier to achieve than another, and that the destruction of infra-structure of existing society might be harder than taking control of its structure/super-structure (the aim of conventional revolutions). What I am trying to say is that means may not be that important for the kind of revolution Kaczynski is proposing.

U.R.: First of all I want to make clear that in this entire exchange I am going to give only my own opinions. Notwithstanding that some of them refer to Ted Kaczynski's ideas and are based on what I know about his thoughts, they are only my opinions. So every time I say something here about the purpose or meaning of something that Kaczynski says it should be understood only as my own interpretation of it, not as if it were necessarily what he wanted to mean with it. I agree with him in many points, and I think that I know and understand most of the ideas he has been making public in recent years, but I am not his spokesperson. If you actually want to know what Kaczynski does think about all the issues discussed below, you should ask him directly.

I know well that historical revolutionary movements not only wanted and tried to destroy the old society (or at least its structure and super-structure) but also to construct a new one. But given that an efficient movement against technoindustrial society should only try to carry out a destructive "revolution" (that is, the movement shouldn't try to create a new society, only to destroy the old one), I think that what Kaczynski suggests that could be useful to study (though he doesn't say it explicitly) are not the past efforts to create new societies but *only* (or mainly) the attempts of past movements to organize themselves (for gaining power) in order to take over or to destroy the old societies (or at least their structure). And thus in my critique I referred only to these "destructive" attempts. See footnote 3 of my critique.

Regarding the three levels of a society, as far as I know, Kaczynski never has mentioned explicitly the terms "infra-structure", "structure", and "super-structure", so he never has said clearly and explicitly that the goal of a movement against techno-industrial society should be to destroy its infra-structure. He only speaks about destroying technoindustrial society (or, what is the same, the technoindustrial system), but it is not clear that he always sees and makes a clear distinction among social infra-structure, structure and super-structure (or at least, between the two former) and it is not clear either that he always sees and takes into account the existing hierarchical relationships among them (that is, the determination of the structure and super-structure by infra-structure; i.e., the greater importance of the infra-structure and the dependency of structure and super-structure on the infra-structure).

And there are many signs that suggest that, indeed, he maybe has not a clear enough idea about this issue. For example, when he says in note 160, page 133 of Anti-Tech Revolution (Fitch & Madison, 2016)[6] that "The system could be 'killed' by shutting down one or more of its essential functions (e.g.,, computer networks, electrical power grid, or transportation and communication facilities), *but the death of the system might also be achieved in some other way*" (italics added) it could be understood, *among other things*, that he is giving too much importance and preponderance to other parts of the system beyond infra-structure, that is, to the structure (or maybe even to the super-structure; though he actually seems at least to regard trying to change super-structure – or, as he says, "preaching ideas and values"- as something quite inefficient). And thus, it could be understood that he is thinking that the system could be also destroyed *merely* taking over, destroying or changing its structure (or maybe, though not much probably if I have understood him properly, even changing or destroying its super-structure). Another sign of that Kaczynski could not be understanding or taking always into account the importance of clearly differentiating the three levels or main parts of a society would be his definition of "technology", which includes super-structural (techniques; technical knowledge) or structural (organizational forms) elements in addition to infra-structural ones (material apparatuses or tools). See, e.g., *Technological Slavery*, Feral House, 2010, page 375[7].

And if he is giving so much importance to the study of past revolutions it could be also because maybe he doesn't see clearly, or take enough into account, the differences among infra-structure, structure and super-structure and he doesn't see clearly either the differences among the real outcomes produced by trying to change or destroy each of them (or at least the two former). For example, when he speaks about the past revolutionary movements, he often speaks about them as if they had destroyed their societies entirely (see, for example, point 182 in *Industrial Society and Its Future*), not just as movements that destroyed or changed only the extant social structure and, maybe, part of the super-structure, which was the actual and only outcome in most, if not all, past revolutions. In fact, too often he speaks in his texts about destroying "social order" (that is, social structure) as a synonym of destroying society as a whole (see, for example, *Technological Slavery*, pages 256, 279 and 369-70[8]). But both things are not the same. "Social order" is only the social structure, not the whole society, and it is not even the most important part of society. The most important part is infra-structure, that is, its material base.

---

[6] Page 194 in Soregra's edition (2016), and page 162 in Publit Soluções Editoriais' edition (2016).

[7] In this text, when U.R. refers to *Technological Slavery*, he refers always to Feral House's edition. Footnotes have been added in each case to indicate the corresponding pages in the later published Fitch & Madison's edition, volume one, 2019. In this particular case the page number is 259 in the Fitch & Madison's edition.

[8] Or pages 129, 151 and 242 in the Fitch & Madison's edition.

E.P: At point number 5 of your critique of *Anti-Tech Revolution* you say that the aim of the anti-technological movement is totally different from those of old revolutionary movements. Their aim was to change the structure and super-structure of the society and develop further the infra-structure of the society, whereas anti-tech movement's aim must be to physically destroy the infra-structure of technological society. For this reason, anti-tech movement can't use the old models of revolutions, old organizational structures.

U.R.: Where have I said that a movement which *truly* pursues the destruction of the technoindustrial system for the sake of wild Nature "can't use the old models of revolutions, old organizational structures" *because* its goal should be merely destructive and not constructive?

(By the way, as you should already know if you have read my whole critique, I don't like to use neither the term "anti-tech" nor the term "revolution" to refer to the organized attempt to destroy the technoindustrial system for the sake of wild Nature).

First, the model of a revolution is not only its organizational structures. It includes also its strategies, its goals, its ideas and values, its means, its activities, etc. All of them constitute a set of interrelated elements that can be called "the model of a revolution".

Second, I agree that, to a great extent, the models of past revolutions are not adequate for destroying present (neither probably future) technoindustrial society. But, in particular, I think that *maybe some* of their organizational structures, strategies and other means could be taken, *to some extent*, as reference; or better said, they could be studied to try to obtain practical ideas that, *after the necessary fixes*, are applicable to the struggle against technoindustrial society. I have never rejected utterly this method. The problem is that Kaczynski, in *Anti-Tech Revolution*, doesn't say *clearly* and *explicitly* which particular details and traits are worth of study and which not, and in such case, what are *exactly* the concrete lessons that should be learned. In this particular aspect he is too vague. And I also think that it is a problem that he gives too much importance to these studies, when there can be (and I think that surely are) other ways of getting useful ideas for the task of destroying technoindustrial society, and that maybe they could be even more important than the study of past revolutions or present political movements.

And third, the reason why a movement against technoindustrial society shouldn't use the "old models of revolutions" is not that its goal is merely destructive, but mainly that those old models are designed to destroy only the social structure and super-structure, at the most, but not the infra-structure of their societies; and also that the ideas, values and goals of those old revolutions were popular ones, and then, many of their ways of acting were intrinsically oriented to get the support of masses and to make the most of it, so they are useless for attaining the inherently unpopular goal of destroying the technoindustrial infra-structure.

E.P.: I haven't said that you said a movement which truly pursues the destruction of the techno-industrial system for the sake of wild Nature can't use the old models of revolutions, old organizational structures *because* its goal should be merely destructive and not constructive. What I have said is that: "At number 5 of your criticism you say that, the aim of anti-technological movement is totally different from old revolutionary movements. Their aim was to change the structure and super-structure of the society and develop further the infra-structure of the society, whereas anti-tech movement's aim must be to physically destroy the infra-structure of technological society. *For this reason* (i.e., anti-tech revolution needs to destroy infra-structure, but conventional revolutions wants to modify structure and super-structure and develop further infra-structure) anti-tech movement can’t use the old models of revolutions, old organizational structures”.

U.R.: OK, thanks for the explanation in brackets. Now it is clearer what you meant. I’m sorry for my misunderstanding.

E.P.: I have used the terms “anti-tech” and “revolution” for convenience sake, as abbreviations.

U.R.: I understand it, and I think that Kaczynski’s reasons for using those terms are similar than yours, but what I was questioning precisely is that “convenience”. Is it worth or not using them for saving effort, space and time, making reading (and only reading, not understanding) easier and simplifying the text? If using terms that are historically or ideologically loaded, vague, or misleading, or using terms that are usually used with meanings much different from those with which you are trying to use them, you favour misunderstandings (and even worse things, like attracting undesirable, low-quality people to your ideas and projects), is it then worth using them, however much the “convenience” (comfort, easiness, simplicity) of using them could be? I think not.

E.P.: You also say that conventional revolutionary projects can appeal to masses easier, because they promise a materially richer, easier to live society. I don’t see the point that an anti-tech revolution should be a popular one or appeal to masses.

U.R.: Yes, I say the former, but not the latter. In fact, I don’t see the point that a movement *truly* against technoindustrial society for the sake of wild Nature should be popular or appeal to the masses, either. Quite the opposite. What I say in my critique is precisely that a movement which *truly* attempts to destroy the technoindustrial system for the sake of wild Nature will be neither popular nor appealing to the masses, and that, consequently, it should always take this into account and acknowledge it. And therefore, it shouldn’t act and think of itself as it were popular and appealing to the masses, and it shouldn’t waste its energy and time trying neither to be popular nor to appeal to the masses.

I say this because it is not clear (at least to me) that Kaczynski has always this fact into account. Sometimes it seems to me that he suggests that the masses (or at least a big part of them) could at some point sympathize and identify with a movement that *truly* tried to physically destroy the infra-structure of the technoindustrial society for the sake of wild Nature, and that they could somehow embrace its values, ideas and goal. I think that, maybe, at some point, the masses could lose their faith in modern technology and in the social system determined by it, and that then, they could be more susceptible of being manipulated and used by a skilful movement against the technoindustrial system in order to attain its goal. Though maybe this never will happen. But this is not the same than to say or suggest that the masses actually and deliberately will sympathize with this movement and that they actually share its values, ideas and goal. The latter is not true and never will.

And Kaczynski seems to suggest this probably because he is taking past revolutions, which were all popular, appealed to masses and designed their whole strategy basing on this fact and taking advance of it, as a major reference for his own strategy. At least sometimes, he seems to be taking this past popular and mass-oriented strategy and trying to adapt it and to apply it to the pursuit of the goal of destroying technoindustrial society. And he pretends it to work. But it can’t work.

So, as you can see, I am not saying precisely that a movement against technoindustrial society should be popular and appeal to the masses.

E.P.: I don’t say that *you* think a movement truly against techno-industrial society for the sake of wild nature should be a popular one. I say that *I* don’t see the point. As far as I understand, you don’t state explicitly in your critique whether popularity is a desired criteria or a thing that would do more harm and should be avoided. You simply say it as a fact that, because of its values, a movement against techno-industrial society will be unpopular and better take that into account.

U.R.: OK, now I understand that you didn’t say that I think a movement truly against techno-industrial society for the sake of wild nature should be a popular one. Thanks for the explanation.

E.P.: I don’t know if you agree but it seems to me the organization Kaczynski proposes is more or less a Leninist one, i.e., a hierarchical structure, a strong leadership, committed cadres, opportunistic attitude towards daily situations and power balances, infiltrations of rival factions, etc.

U.R.: Well, I wouldn’t call it “Leninist” (and I think that Kaczynski wouldn’t either), because its ideology, its values and its goal wouldn’t be the Leninist ones. But, anyway, I understand what you are trying to say with this adjective: that it should be a somewhat “Leninist-like” organization, in the sense that it should be a well organized movement, with a clear hierarchical structure, and very disciplined and committed members, like at least some revolutionary Leninist organizations used to be in the twentieth century. And, yes, Kaczynski seems to be also suggesting that it should have some other less clearly valuable “Leninist-like” traits, like to be a very opportunistic organization which uses infiltrations of other organizations or factions and the like. But not only Leninist organizations show these traits. Many of these traits, especially the most important and valuable ones (hierarchy, discipline, commitment, etc.) are present in other non-Leninist groups and organizations (e.g., in some military and paramilitary organizations, in some organized religious groups, in some mafias, etc.).

And, on the other hand, the organization could also be called “Leninist-like” because Kaczynski has obviously taken Leninist organizations (among other Marxist and non-Marxist political organizations) as a major reference.

Independently of the denomination you want to use to call it, I agree only in that the organization should be quite hierarchical (which would mean that there should be somewhat restrictions to a democratic, egalitarian or horizontal inner functioning), and in that its members should be quite disciplined and committed. Otherwise it wouldn’t be efficient (and its purpose should be to be efficient in attaining the destruction of the technoindustrial system, not to be just, democratic, egalitarian, ethical, etc).

Regarding political opportunism, infiltrations and other similar nasty traits, as I implicitly show in point 56 of my critique, I have serious doubts about their real efficiency. Too often they have been so stupidly, clumsily, unskilfully and blatantly proposed and used that the outcomes have frequently been quite counterproductive: those organizations which have tried to use them have often been detected, and many times not only rejected by their potential “victims” but regarded as shameless, and lost their credibility to many other people’s eyes. But I can’t also reject all of those disagreeable traits absolutely. Maybe *in some cases*, and subtly, smartly and skilfully applied, some of them could be effective.

E.P.: Since it is not a constructive one, anti-tech revolution’s aim can be reached by a very small minority. The physical destruction of the infra-structure can be done by a small number of people, maybe even by one individual technically capable of doing that harm. And if this aim can be reached by physically harming the system's essential functions, it seems to me more of a technical problem (what its essential functions are, how they can be harmed, what the level of sufficient harming is) rather than a political one. Then, why all this emphasis in organizing and creating the power base? Why Kaczynski proposes a Leninist party organization?

U.R.: Well, *theoretically*, the destruction of the technoindustrial system's infra-structure perhaps could be realized even by a single, able and skilful (he should be very skilful, indeed) and/or very powerful individual, as you say. But *in practice*, and *in reality*, this is not very likely to happen. It probably won't be something as simple as merely using directly an easily available and usable means to solve a technical problem. Probably it will be much more difficult and complicated (too much for a single individual) and will require the work of at least a group, a team, and to take some intermediate steps and indirect approaches. Maybe this group won't have to be a big group of people. Maybe a few able and committed individuals will be enough. Or maybe not. Or at least not always.

I mean that the ways through which the goal of physically destroying the technoindustrial system could be achieved, and the particular details of these ways, probably would be complicated and they are impossible to predict too far ahead. But, roughly, one can reasonably argue that, more likely than not, a movement or organization will be necessary to achieve the necessary means and capacity to carry out the physical destruction of the technoindustrial system. A single individual usually hasn't access to those means, neither usually has enough resources, skills and ability to use them, and probably never will. The means to physically destroy the infra-structure of the tecnoindustrial system are usually on the hands of organizations (usually large and powerful organizations, indeed) or at least are only available to them, not to single individuals. And, besides, those who want to get rid of the technoindustrial system usually haven't easy and direct access to those means and to use them. So those who want to destroy the technoindustrial system should get together and organized to achieve, as a group, enough power (that is, enough capacity: technological resources, skills, funds, political influence, etc.) to finally get access to those means. And once this access is achieved, they should use those means quickly and decisively to physically destroy the infra-structure of the technoindustrial system permanently.

And also, maybe, it would even be necessary, at some point, that a few able and committed individuals have to use and lead or manipulate many others to achieve the power necessary to get access to those means. Who knows?

Yes, at first glance, the physical destruction of technoindustrial society is mainly a technical problem, but at this stage, I hope to have already shown you convincingly enough that to solve this supposedly mere technical problem one could have to act also "politically" (I use here the term "political" with the sense of any activity aimed to attain some influence in the social structure). If only to get access to the necessary means to solve it and to attain the ability to use them. I referred to this with the phrase "en realidad se producen retroalimentaciones, es decir, la estructura y la superestructura pueden influir a su vez en la infraestructura, reforzándola o debilitándola, por ejemplo" [there are feedback loops actually, i.e., structure and super-structure can in turn influence the infra-structure, strengthening it or weakening it, for example"], and especially with "Puede que sea necesario, en algún momento, incidir en la estructura o en la superestructura (para, por ejemplo, lograr el poder necesario para alterar suficientemente la infraestructura)" ["It can be necessary, at some point, to have some influence on the structure or on the super-structure (in order to, for example, achieve the power necessary to enough alter the infra-structure).”]

So a movement or organization could be, and probably will, be necessary. Along with some kind of “political” activity. And, as I have said above, the movement should be quite hierarchical, disciplined and committed (“Leninist-like”, if you prefer to call it so) to be efficient.

E.P.: You criticize Kaczynski for proposing a very broad, general usage tool, and say that the tools that have broad usage and not specific have less efficiency.

U.R.: When have I criticized Kaczynski for proposing a very broad, general usage tool? Which tool? The movement against the technoindustrial system? Where have I said that it is a broad-purpose tool? I only wrote briefly about multi-purpose tools as an illustrative example to try to explain that the choosing of the means should be dependent of the goals pursued, basing on *efficiency* criteria. I didn’t say that Kaczynski proposes multi-purpose tools or that a movement against the technoindustrial system is (like) a multi-purpose tool.

E.P.: When I consider the final aim (to destroy the infra-structure of technological society) and also take into account the fact that, after this destructive event, there would be no further missions, no preaching and educating the masses, no creating new social relations, etc. I don’t see the importance of suitable means. Means may not be that important for this kind of revolution. Because its mission is done once it eliminates the infra-structure, then the system’s dominant power to control and subjugate the wild nature will be shattered. It won’t try to create a new complex social structure, won’t preach new values. Of course those people who would be in that movement would have some values and ideas about how life should be lived. But they will not try to make this values universally shared. When I think on that line, I don’t see why means would be important for this kind of a revolutionary project. A generally used, broad tool might do the trick. If it is the most effective way, why not use also a Leninist organization? On the contrary, for conventional revolutions means might be more important. Let’s consider one trying to create a new society without hierarchies. A Leninist organization might create a problem for this aim. Because a Leninist organization will be hierarchical, a society shaped by this organization will have this tendency also.

U.R.: First, what do you mean exactly by “adequacy”? Efficiency or something else? In my critique, and here, I only refer to efficiency (that is the ability to attain a goal with the minimum waste of energy, time and resources). I am not taking into account other dubious criteria for choosing and using means that many people tend to refer to, like the moral character of means and the moral influence of means over goals, for example. I think that at least sometimes (like in this particular case) the end justifies the means.

You seem to think that the efficiency (“adequacy”) of means is only important when one wants to attain a constructive goal, but I think that it is important always. Why isn’t the efficiency of means important in attaining a destructive goal? How can you attain it if the means used are too inefficient? If the means are not minimally efficient, you can’t even attain a goal, either constructive or destructive. And if they are not much efficient, the goal (constructive or destructive) will be much more difficult to attain. And not all means are equally efficient for each task. If one wants to attain a goal (constructive or destructive) he always should choose (if possible) the most efficient means which is available.

Efficiency is paramount, especially in this issue, because the energy, time and resources of the movement could be, and probably will be, quite limited. It can’t afford to waste them indefinitely in successive attempts, because it probably won’t have many chances to achieve its goal. It should do everything that it can to minimize the probabilities of fail and to maximize the probabilities of success. So, if only in terms of saving effort and time and of assuring the proper achievement of the goal, it is important to choose the adequate means.

And if, as I have shown above, most likely it will be necessary that the movement carries out some kind of organizational and “political” activity in order to get ready for attaining and for using the necessary means for physically destroying the technoindustrial system eventually, then means are important too. Because to carry out properly those “political” and technical tasks in order to achieve that goal, some means are more efficient than others; and some other means even could be useless or counterproductive.

Even if, as you seem to think, the problem of physically destroying the infra-structure of technoindustrial society were merely a technical one, which could be simply solved with the single and direct application of some particular means, this would require to choose the adequate, that is, efficient *means* for doing the task. You can’t use any tool to carry out any task. You can use some tools but not others, and you preferably will use those specific tools designed for the task if you can choose.

Second, you say that the movement against technoindustrial society is (like) a multi-purpose tool. I never have said this, and I don’t know, neither mind, if it actually is or not, but let’s assume that it is for the sake of the argument. You also say “If it is the most effective way, why not use also a Leninist organization?” But how it could be the *most effective* way if, in fact, as I said in my critique, multi-purpose tools tend to be *less efficient* than one-purpose tools? This is nonsense.

Anyway, if a “Leninist-like” organization were necessary to destroy technoindustrial society, it should be created and used, but not because it is a multi-purpose tool or not, but simply because it would be necessary (that is, there would be no other alternative means available which were more efficient) to actually attain the goal. When there is no other really alternative means, the one that there is, is the only available one and the one “chosen”, independently of its efficiency. In Spain we say: “Si no hay más, contigo Tomás” (which basically means “If there is no one else available, I choose you”).

And third, as I said in my critique, the efficiency of means depends on the goals they are designed and used for, and it is inextricably linked to them. Some political means are inherently oriented to achieve the support of the masses or to reinforce it and to take advance of it. But if there is no such support, or/and if it is not wanted or needed, those means are useless. And then, taking those means as a pattern to act and applying them in one’s own strategy would be ridiculous and stupid, or even could be counterproductive (if only because it implies to waste energy, time and resources).

For example, of what utility would be to hold street demonstrations, to cry slogans, to spread posters, leaflets or banners, etc. against technoindustrial society? How many people would share the message and sympathize with their promoters? How many people would be inspired to join to the cause and to be active members of the movement against the technoindustrial system (assuming that there were actually such a movement and that it actually needed any random people to join it; which is not true)? Very few, if any. And what effect would that kind of public political activities have on the technoindustrial system, or at least on its structure? (That is, would they influence those individuals or organizations that have enough power to try to stop the development of society?). None at all. In most cases, those means wouldn't even change the super-structure. Such kind of public activities could be useful for the achievement of the popular goals of some political movements, at least sometimes, because those movements usually have the support of the masses (or they tend to pretend to have it because they need it), and this way they try to take advance of it in order to achieve those popular goals. But those means are not appropriate to be used by a movement that pursuits the physical destruction of the technoindustrial system for the sake of wild Nature, which won't be popular, neither should try to be popular. In case of this movement used those means, they wouldn't constitute but lamentable spectacles and some kind of not even really satisfactory surrogate activities for those who carried out them.

But other kind of "political" means could be useful and even necessary for such a movement in order to achieve the access to the means necessary to physically destroy the technoindustrial system and to attain the capacity to use them.

E.P.: Let's assume that the anti-tech revolution can be done most effectively by a Leninist party organization. The first aim of Leninist organizations is to seize the state apparatus. After that, they plan to use this apparatus to shape their ideal society. They will increase production, distribute it more equally, etc. For this reason, Leninist organization is designed to seize the state apparatus. So, at some point, will an anti-tech organization seize the state apparatus or management of society? What good would do seizing the state apparatus for an anti-tech movement? Is that or can it be an aim of anti-tech movement? Does Kaczynski propose that an anti-tech organization should, at some point, seize the state-apparatus, and manage the society? (He seems to propose that in point 11 at pages 148-149 of Fitch & Madison edition[9].) How long can it hold on to it considering the fact that it would be a mess when it starts to do what it should be doing?

U.R.: Well, perhaps, at some point, seizing state apparatus could be one of the political means that a movement against technoindustrial society could use to achieve the access to the means necessary to physically destroy the technoindustrial system and to attain the capacity to use them that I referred to in the last paragraph of the previous answer. States are large and powerful organizations that have enough capacity, resources, funds, technological means, etc. to physically and permanently disable the infra-structure of the technoindustrial system. So taking over one or some of them could be, at some point, one necessary or convenient stage to attain the main goal of destroying technoindustrial society. Or maybe it won't.

If, at some point, seizing state apparatus were necessary or convenient, the goal always should remain to destroy the technoindustrial system, neither to reform it nor to rule over it. State apparatus management by the movement against the technoindustrial system should be totally oriented to attain the goal of destroying the technoindustrial society and should be temporary and very brief, precisely, among other reasons, because it would imply that society will become a mess. Movement's management of the state should try to attain the goal immediately and quickly, before a reaction to the social mess caused by it can overthrow movement's rule.

Anyway, as I said in "Basic requirements for creating an efficient movement against the technoindustrial system" and in point 6 of my critique, if actually there is not even a movement (still?), all this is mere speculation and it isn't worth expanding deeper on this issue.

---

[9] Pages 214-216 in Soregra's edition, and pages 181-183 in Publit Soluções Editoriais' edition.

E.P.: I must confess that I don't understand exactly what Kaczynski means by revolution. I understand the final objective, but I am not sure whether destroying technological society can be classified as a *"clear and concrete goal"*, as stated at postulate 1 in chapter 3, "How to Transform a Society: Errors to Avoid", in *Anti-Tech Revolution*.

U.R.: I think that, to some extent, even Kaczynski himself doesn't know what he means by "revolution". Or I think that at least he has not explained it well enough. I understand what you mean, and I often have similar doubts, though not regarding the very goal of destroying technoindustrial society but regarding the particular means and steps that should be adopted to attain this goal. The task may be clear but, is it concrete enough? As I have said, it would not be a simple technical problem with a single, easily available, directly applicable, concrete solution. I don't think that Kaczynski has always explained and detailed the necessary means and steps as clearly and concretely as he should have and as it should be desirable; though I have to acknowledge that maybe, at least sometimes, it couldn't have been done much more clearly and concretely, because of the inherent unpredictability of those issues. (See points 10 and 17 of my critique). And this is, in my opinion, one of the main reasons why many of those who read his texts can't figure exactly what he means by "revolution", what he means (and what he does not mean) exactly by "destroying the technoindustrial system" and how it could be done.

E.P.: Going back to Kaczynski's definition of technology, I sense Ellul's influence on it. According to Ellul, technique is the encompassing whole, invading every aspect of life and substituting itself against nature. It is turning everything -production, social relations, entertainment, even religion- to a technique. It is a one big totality with every aspect that constitutes it. *Le Systeme Technicien.*

U.R.: Yes, probably it could be Ellul's influence. Kaczynski seems to have Ellul in great consideration as a thinker. But I, for my part, regard Ellul's writings as tedious, not much clear, difficult to read and to understand, not always much wise, and not very interesting or worth reading. At least regarding his style, he was just another stodgy, humanist, social-"scientist" author.

And in this particular case, with his notion of "technique" he seems to mix up material elements, organizational elements and ideological elements of society in a hodgepodge whole. If "technique" is regarded as everything and vice versa, then this doesn't help to better understand and to have a clearer idea about the whole (the technoindustrial system), and about its constituent parts and the interactions among them; rather the opposite. And one should have an idea of the system as clear as possible if he is trying to criticize and/or to combat it.

Moreover, one thing is the material tools, and another the methods. Here it can be also a problem with the different languages used. I don't know if in French "Technique" (taken as a noun) means exactly the same as "Technique" noun in English or "Técnica" noun in Spanish, but I suspect that at least sometimes they are not used exactly in the same way in each language. In Spanish, *conventionally* and most of the times "técnica" is understood as the methods and "tecnología" as the tools. Sometimes, some people use "técnica" to refer also to "tecnología" (tools), but I think this promotes confusion, so I usually try not to use it this way. And, of course, nobody minimally intelligent uses "tecnología" to refer to "técnica" (methods and procedures) in Spanish. And in English, as far as I know, the nouns “technique” and “technology” are *conventionally* used in a similar way than “técnica” and “tecnología” are used in Spanish.

But Kaczynski does not use the term “technology” in a conventional manner. He uses “technology” to refer to both, tools (what conventionally means “technology”) and procedures (conventionally regarded as “techniques”), and also even to relationships (organizational forms), and to ideologies, etc. which in my opinion is to blur and to get things mixed up, hindering the clear and correct comprehension and favouring misunderstanding. If one gets all those things mixed up under the term “technology” -or under the term “technique”, like Ellul does-, one actually will not attain (nor will help others to attain) a complete understanding of what is the system and how it works. One (or those who take Kaczynski’s definition of “technology” as reference) maybe can get a better understanding of the technoindustrial system than those who only see some isolated parts without associating them in a whole, but their notion of the whole will be still blurred and unclear.

One should be able to see both, the trees and the forest they constitute, without getting them mixed up. One thing is to have relationship, another to be the same. One thing is that the constituent elements of a system interact mutually, and that even sometimes these interactions can be inextricable, and another that then those elements and interactions are all the same, indistinguishable each from another, without categories and hierarchies among them, and/or that they merge into a homogeneous unity in which one can’t distinguish its constituent parts anymore. To understand a system one should keep on seeing clearly its particular elements and the particular relationships between them *besides* the system as a whole.

E.P: Perhaps when you look at it from this perspective (Ellul’s “technique” as a one big system), hierarchies at three levels classification tend to blur or disappear. But when one evaluates these two perspectives (three levels classification vs. all encompassing technical system) with practical criteria, i.e., which one is more conducive to have a concrete target to attack, three levels classification is getting the upper hand. Because, how do you attack biotechnology or techniques of chemistry? But, you have some more concrete targets under the classification of infra-structure.

U.R.: Yes, and all those targets (technology, modes of production, means of transport and communication and demography), being infra-structure, are necessary for the subsistence of the technoindustrial social system. If you destroy any of them, the whole system will fall apart. And unlike structure and super-structure, they are relatively concrete material things that can be physically destroyed.

E.P: On the other hand, “all encompassing technical system view” might be needed to be emphasized in order to show that the techno-industrial system can be dumped only as a whole. You can’t differentiate the bad parts from the good parts. All parts affect each other, are dependent on each other and shape each other. Anyway, these two perspectives (the tree level classification and the all encompassing technical system view) need not be mutually exclusive.

U.R.: Well, as I have said above, one thing is to show that the particular elements that constitute a whole interact in different ways, depending on their own particular natures (that is, depending on if they are material things and processes, organizational relationships or ideas), following a hierarchy and an order (not all are equally important or necessary for the system, they don’t influence equally its development and functioning, etc.), and other is to get all mixed up in a mish-mash. So both approaches are indeed mutually exclusive. One has to see simultaneously the trees and the forest, not only the trees or only the forest. In fact, they are three (not only two) different and incompatible perspectives. And only one is right.

E.P.: Besides because of not seeing clearly the differences among infra-structure, structure and super-structure and the real outcomes that produces trying to change or destroy each of them (or at least the two former), neither taking them enough into account, Kaczynski could be giving so much importance to the study of past revolutions because these are the only examples of relatively unimportant people (not in the upper echelons of society) being able to influence fundamentally the structure of their society and flow of history.

I refer for example to points (i), (ii) and (iii) at page 256[10] of *Technological Slavery*.[11] I think that (i) and (iii) cannot be considered as a genuine interference on the part of humans to the course of history, because at (i) and (iii), there is no possibility of reversing or changing the direction of the course of history. At most, at (i), one can only slow down the course of history. At (iii), there isn't even that, one is only accelerating the course of history. So there is, in fact, only one possibility that humans can consciously influence and change the course of history and that is the number (ii), a destructive revolution.

Kaczynski is mostly concerned to find some examples that humans interfered with the course of history on a deliberate way. Cases in which people, not in the upper echelons of political activity or institutions of state or at some other higher hierarchies of society but, in spite of that, able to influence the course of history on a radical way. Not only gaining some political and economical advantages but also changing the structure of state and positions of classes. Of course these are very short of destroying infra-structure, but these are the only examples, relatively "unimportant" people jumping on to the stage of history. There isn't to my knowledge any example where people consciously destroyed their society's infra-structure.

U.R.: Yes, all this issue about interfering on the course of history by relatively unimportant people is very interesting, but what I was referring to and trying to prove was only that Kaczynski at least sometimes seems to get mixed up the "social order" (structure) with the society as a whole (the social system, which is constituted by infra-structure and super-structure, besides structure). I was trying to show you instances in which he suggests that past revolutionaries (independently whether they were unimportant people or not) did destroy the pre-existing societies, i.e., whole social systems; which is not true at all. Furthermore, in some of those instances (like page 256[12] of *Technological Slavery*, point (ii)), he is even explicitly and actually speaking about destroying the pre-existing "social order" (which is not the same than the pre-existing society as a whole; the pre-existing social system). So Kaczynski gets "social order" mixed up with the whole society, i.e., the social system. This is all what I was speaking about.

Regarding the possibility for current people to interfere in the course of history, since you have brought it up, I even doubt that point (ii) of page 256[13] of *Technological*

---

[10] Or page 129 in the Fitch & Madison edition.

[11] The points E.P. is referring to are: "(i) Intelligent administration can prolong the life of an existing social order … (ii) Revolutionary action can bring about, or at least hasten, the breakdown of an existing social order … (iii) An existing social order can sometimes be extended to encompass additional territory."

[12] Or page 129 in the Fitch & Madison edition.

[13] *Ídem.*

Slavery really means that ordinary (that is unimportant, powerless) people can interfere effectively in the course of history. Unimportant people, by definition, can't influence the development of a society. Otherwise they wouldn't be so "unimportant". To influence history one has to previously get power and somewhat "importance". That is, before anyone can affect the course of the development of a society he/they should get power, social influence, resources, etc.; i.e., he/they should quit being "current people", unimportant people, and become relatively powerful and influential people.

On the other hand, regarding points (i) and (iii) of page 256[14] of *Technological Slavery*, independently of what Kaczynski exactly says or wanted to say with them (and I am not sure that he means exactly what you say he means, because he doesn't mention anything about the "importance" of people), they could *actually* be seen from a somewhat different perspective that indeed could refer to clear ways of interfering with the course of history (i.e., with the direction of the development of a society). In (i) if the administration is not intelligent at all, the society can break down even if otherwise it didn't necessarily have to, while if administration is intelligent enough, it can not only *postpone* this kind of potential breakdown (a disaster caused by a bad and foolish administration) in the short term, but can even avoid it completely in the middle or long term. It is not only to slow down the history. Likewise, an idiot can act so recklessly that he can have an accident and die too soon, while a more intelligent and prudent individual can avoid easily the cause of death that killed the other and, hopefully and with enough luck, he can live for many years. Of course, everybody ends dying eventually, but to avoid accidents, dangers, diseases or hunger through intelligent and prudent behaviour it is not merely a short temporary prolongation of an already almost ended life. Of course, there are many other more influential, "objective" (i.e., independent of human will), unpredictable and uncontrollable factors that tend to determine much more often, powerfully and in the long term the course of one's life or of history, independently of one's intelligence or of the skilfulness of social administrators, respectively, to avoid some potentially disastrous outcomes. So in my opinion, rational and conscious control usually has not much influence in such processes. But sometimes, in isolated cases, and to some quite limited extent, human will and conscience maybe could play some role in interfering importantly with the course of real complex processes like individual life or social history, through avoiding (and not only through postponing or slowing down) some potential disasters.

And regarding (iii), likewise, in some cases the expansion of a society's territory can avoid completely a breakdown that otherwise would have likely occurred. It can provide the necessary space, energy and materials to maintain and even develop this society in the long term. This is what could have happened to a great extent, for example, when Europeans expanded over the globe from fifteenth century on. It is not an acceleration, it is to avoid an otherwise unavoidable stagnation or even a breakdown (European societies before their global expansion were already lacking space, energy and/or resources to keep on growing; if they wouldn't expanded their territories through the Earth, they probably would have stopped their growth or even collapsed –they would have fallen down to a less complex and developed level-).

Of course, one even could ask serious and deeper questions about the real meaning of "potential", "probable" or "possible"; about the real "objective" factors that make that some persons or some society's administrators, but not others, are (or act like they were) stupid or negligent; about the real "objective" factors that determine seemingly

---

[14] *Ídem.*

“subjective”, *ex nihilo* factors like human will and conscience; etc. But, though deep down important and interesting, those questions probably would take us philosophically too far away from the matter we are talking about (the possibility of rationally influencing the course of the development of human societies, in order to know if is possible to destroy the technoindustrial system) and this would not be very practical.

Anyway, certainly the only point of *direct* practical importance for a movement against technoindustrial society for the sake of wild Nature, would be (ii).

E.P.: In point 5 of your critique you say “What a movement actually contrary to the technoindustrial system will value and want to attain will be completely different from what past revolutionaries or most of the more recent ‘political’ movements valued and pretended to attain and/or attained. And this will make that many times, or even in most cases, the means, strategies, activities, methods of action, etc. that that movement have to use can’t (and mustn’t) be the same than those that past revolutionaries used. The more different the values and goal of the movement against technoindustrial society are from those of the past revolutionaries, the more different from past revolutionaries’ will have to be the means and ways which that movement must use to attain its goal, and thus the less useful and practical information can be extracted from the study of such historic movements and cases to attain this goal.”

Here, you are not only emphasizing the difference of targets (destruction of infra-structure vs. modification of structure and super-structure) but also difference of values. Difference of values is also important for choosing or developing a “tool”.

U.R.: Of course, but it is so because, *in principle*, goals tend to be determined by values or principles, that is, by what one considers important, desirable, despicable or bad. Why one chooses some goals and not others? *In principle*, because one has some particular values but not others. *In principle*, one chooses those goals that fit his values and rejects those that enter conflict or are incompatible with his values. So, values are important because the election and adoption of goals are greatly determined by them. But, *in practice*, there are also other factors that can influence the choosing of the goals, so sometimes it is not as simple as “you have this value, so you have to have this goal”, or vice versa.

For example, many people are so foolish or have their mind so confused that they don’t even know which their actual values are and, too often, they even explicitly defend several contradictory values (and thus goals) simultaneously. Or many other people adopt the values of their social environment or at least let these values to influence them, even though these values are not actually their real, natural values (those that they naturally feel deep inside), and so they also adopt goals that actually don’t fit their actual values. But for those who are clear in their minds about which are their own principles and which not, it usually is also clear which should be their goals.

And, also the same goal can sometimes be defended by people with different principles. For example, as I have said, some people, which are not very clear in their minds about their values at some moment, can let their social environment’s values to influence them and so they end up defending goals which actually don’t fit their actual deep values. And these goals can be the same than other people’s, who are clear in their minds about which are their actual values. Another example: some people who are deliberately defending some other people’s cause (and thus these other people’s values and goals) to eventually achieve their own personal or “political” goals, etc. which are not actually the same than these latter people’s goals.

And sometimes, people with the same values can defend different goals, because some of their principles are the same but not others; or because some of them are clear in their minds about some of their values but not about others; etc.

So, though values could be not enough to reliably separate those who are worth working/joining with from the rest, they are important and help a lot to filter people who are worth joining/working with or not, because values influence greatly in which are the chosen goals.

One should not try to join for defending a cause with people whose main values are incompatible with his, because eventually there will be problems: It will end being explicitly clear that their actual goals are other than his, that they don't actually want to attain his goals and that, at some point, they even will end opposing to his goals and trying to impose theirs. This is the actual reason why is important to check and take into account principles and ideologies when joining with others. And, as you can see, it is not simply a philosophical, dogmatic reason, but also and especially a practical one. People with too different principles can't work together for attaining a goal which is determined by the values of some of them, but not by the others' (which even could be actually contrary to the goal). Sooner or later they end having a conflict, the allies become enemies, and the advance of the cause is endangered or even reversed.

E.P.: At your footnote 2 of your critique, you again use the same value distinction: "For example, the study of the history of Earth First! can be useful for a movement that is actually contrary to technoindustrial society, because that movement, at its beginning, had some values that were very similar to those that a movement against technoindustrial society should have, and even some of its members suggested similar goals".

Not only similar aims but also similar values make it useful to study these movements. You are not explicitly saying that it would be more useful to study conservationist movements than studying revolutionary movements, but I sense an undertone on that manner. In fact, I don't think that, studying these conservationist movements will be more useful than studying past revolutions, apart from the lessons about how they have been taken over by leftists and drifted to social justice issues. Because they don't even understand what is causing the destruction of wilderness and for this reason they remain only defensive and think that they can protect wilderness with some laws. On the contrary a movement against techno-industrial system will be offensive (building the tensions inside the society to a breaking point and solving the matter with one or several number of limited blows, not to try to conserve something), and -on this term only- it will be closer to conventional revolutionary movements.

U.R.: Well, at least conservationism (in the sense of preservationism) shares its main value (wild Nature) and *to some extent* its goal (to preserve wild Nature) with a movement against technoindustrial society for the sake of wild Nature, which is a thing that other "political" movements don't. The conservationist's goal of preserving wild Nature is actually a shared goal with a movement against the technoindustrial system for the sake of wild Nature. Because, in fact, the real main goal of this latter movement would be preserving wild Nature (which is its main value) too, though certainly not by legal protection of wilderness and species; nor changing society's super-structure (preaching "ecological" and anti-anthropocentric values); nor reducing population by peaceful and non-lethal means. The goal of destroying the technoindustrial system should be regarded to be the main and only goal of a movement against technoindustrial society for the sake of wild Nature only for practical reasons. Especially because it is actually the necessary requisite to attain the actual most important goal: the effective preservation of the remaining wild Nature and its recovering. In other words, amongst the several practical reasons to regard the destruction of technoindustrial society as the main goal of that movement is that to eliminate technoindustrial society would be the only *attainable and effective* way of stopping the ever-growing destruction and subjugation of wild Nature on Earth, and thus of preserving as much wild Nature as possible and of letting it recover permanently (or at least for a long time). Unfortunately, most conservationists don't see things so and believe (or prefer to believe) that wild Nature on Earth and technoindustrial society can coexist, and that wild Nature could be preserved or even recovered in the long term only by enforcing legal protection, preaching pro-Nature values and ideas, and trying to reduce human population by non-violent means.

I think that conservationist legal protection and recuperation of wilderness certainly deserves some respect and credit, because *at best* could gain some time somewhat slowing down the destruction and subjugation of wilderness *in the sort term*; which would not be a bad thing, though it is not enough at all to stop, not to mention to reverse those destruction and subjugation. And regarding the rest of conservationists' means to protect Nature (preaching conservationist values and reducing population slowly and without violence), they are utterly inefficient and often even ridiculous. Of course, conservationists' goal of preserving wilderness through laws (together with trying to change society's attitude and impact on Nature mainly by preaching anti-anthropocentric ideas and by reducing population peacefully and bloodlessly), instead of attacking and getting rid of modern technology, is impossible to attain and to maintain in the long term because, however legally protected they can be, sooner or later and one way or another, the technoindustrial system will end expanding over the remains of wilderness that are currently left, and destroying or subjugating them.

But, anyway, conservationists' wrong and eventually inefficient means to attain the goal of preserving and recovering wild Nature are not the reason to know better their ideas and movement. The main reasons (or at least those that come to my mind now) are the following:

- I think that the lessons about how a great part of the conservationist movement has been taken over by leftists and drifted to social justice issues are already important and useful enough to make it much worth to study the recent history of this movement; at least in America.
- As one learns about conservationism, it becomes clear that some conservationist movement's members and sympathizers actually feel disgust at modern technology and at the technoindustrial system, though most of them don't develop this negative feeling or intuition rationally and consciously to formulate a sound idea and theory; much less to create a movement and to carry out efficient actions against the technoindustrial system. That is, at least some of them actually do see that what is causing the destruction of wilderness today is the development of technoindustrial civilization, but they don't give much importance to this insight or intuition and prefer to focus in the apparently more positive struggle of trying to legally protect remaining wild places (or/and trying to change and praise ideas and values; or/and to control population growth bloodlessly). But maybe some of this kind of people (those most philosophically materialist, pragmatic and realistic among them) could end up being good recruits for a movement against the technoindustrial system for the sake of wild Nature, if it existed. Who knows?

- Another reason for studying this movement is that they have developed quite much theory about the concepts of wild Nature, wildness, wilderness, etc. and about other related issues which I think is worth knowing well. First, because wild Nature should be the main positive value of a movement of the kind I think should be created against the technoindustrial system, and thus one should know well and be clear in mind about his own values and what do they mean (and what they don't). And second, because wild Nature is not as a simple concept as many could think at first glance. There are many nuances, subtleties, complexities and even traps regarding this concept (and those other concepts related to or derived from it), and to know them is important for avoiding, not only theoretical but even strategical incongruences, errors and naiveties.

And take into account that to say that a movement is worth of study is not the same than to say that one identifies utterly with it or to say that one should join it. Kaczynski considers Bolshevism worth studying, but he himself is not a Bolshevik. Likewise, I am not a conservationist, though I regard conservationism worth studying and knowing about.

And, finally, both things are not mutually exclusive. One can study past revolutionary movements' history, methods, strategy, errors and good decisions and also can study conservationist history, theory, errors and right decisions, if he wants to do it and regards it worth doing.

E.P.: In point 5 of your critique you say: "As I said, historical revolutionaries (and a great part of the present political movements) only pretended to modify society's *structure*, its order, its hierarchy, but not its *infra-structure*, society's material base. Some of them were successful in destroying the structure of the pre-existing societies, but as I have said too, this is not the same than actually destroying the pre-existing societies, because what determines the existence, the character and the development of a society is its material base (*infra-structure*) and they didn't destroy it; nor they even pretended to destroy it. And they often even improved it.

"If one wants to destroy the material base of a society the things that he has to do and the means he has to use are very different from those of that who wants to destroy only the social order has to do and use. Thus, beyond some very limited degree (the cases when affecting *structure* can be necessary for altering *infra-structure*), the study of the methods and practices of those who wanted to destroy just the *structure* of their societies is of no use for actually and utterly destroying technoindustrial society; only its *structure*, at best."

I understand that for you the fundamental difference between conventional revolutions and the one that wants to eliminate techno-industrial society is the respective targets in terms of the 3 levels of society and what they want to do with them. I haven't said that according to you (or to me) the fundamental difference between these two kinds of movements is that the one is destructive and the other is constructive. On the contrary, I have suggested that, if the movement against techno-industrial society is merely a destructive one and its mission ends there, this factor may make these two projects similar in terms of the means to be used in the destructive act. Because in an only destructive act, values you cherish don't have any importance in the act itself. So if someone has an effective tool, effective method for this destructive act, you can use that tool, even if you don't share any of the values he has, even if these values be contrary to yours. Because you are not using these values to construct a society, you are not inculcating these values to any one. You have your own values, you know what is fundamentally contrary to those values and you destroy it. But of course the question remains: Is this the most effective tool for your job? I am not against effectivity and don't think effectivity is not important for a merely destructive aim.

U.R.: Both differences (focusing in affecting or changing different social levels and having different attitudes –i.e., constructive or destructive- about what to do with them) are important, because both greatly affect efficiency in attaining the goal of getting rid of technoindustrial society permanently. Focusing exclusively or mainly in changing structure or, even worst, super-structure is inefficient for changing technoindustrial society radically or deeply enough as to actually save what currently remains of wild Nature on Earth and let it recover. And wanting to make a new "good" society and planning and trying to implement its construction is not only inefficient, it is also counterproductive, because it means to waste scarce time, energy and resources in planning and implementing a goal that (luckily!) can't be attained.

And regarding to using the tools of someone else, even if he has quite different values, well, at first glance it certainly seems that, *in an only destructive act*, if someone had a tool that could be effective for attaining your goal and this tool is available to you, you could use that tool, even if you didn't share any of the values he had; even if his values were contrary to yours. But, as I have said above, things use not to be so simple, and probably, before this definitive and only destructive act, a movement would have to be created and many other "political" steeps would have to be taken. And "political" and "movement" means to join with other individuals to work together for the goal of destroying technoindustrial society. So using someone else's tool probably would mean also working with him, joining with him in order to be able to use his tool for attaining your goal, and if his values are very different or even incompatible with yours, then working together with him probably won't work and this eventually will be a fail. As I have already said, values are important (though not enough) to filter who can work with one for one's goal and who shouldn't.

Anyway, if you think that his tool could be efficient, and he has very different values and goals from yours, but you have enough power so you can take his tool and use it (or force him to use it for you) without having to compromise your own goal, then it would be OK to use it (and/or him). But, as I have said, things usually aren't so easy and simple.

And, moreover, as I have said, values greatly determine goals. If he has designed his tool for his own goals, based on his own values, also it is probable that this tool won't be much efficient for attaining your goal, which will be very different from his, because your goal would be inspired by your own principles which are very different or even contrary to his.

But, of course, the process of fighting the technoindustrial system wouldn't be simple and some steeps should be taken before being ready for the last, definitive strike. And, as I already said, in taking those intermediate steps, maybe the movement should make use of some parts of social structure to some extent in order to gain power, means, resources, etc. to attain the main goal of destroying the technoindustrial system. Then, maybe some tools that at first glance could seem not appropriate to directly attain the goal could be actually useful to take some steps towards it. This can only be seen and valued in each case and situation. But as a general rule (and remember that Kaczynski, in his book, is writing about "grand strategy", not about tactics), what has to be profoundly changed, rather destroyed, is society's infra-structure, not structure, much less super-structure, so the tools should be, at first and generally, those adequate for this task, not for gaining control over structure or for changing super-structure.

E.P.: Until I read your answers to my questions I thought that you thought the different value sets should result automatically in a different "tool set" because of some ethical or moral standings. Now I understand that you are emphasizing difference of values because their consequence is difference of targets.

U.R.: Exactly, because values determine goals.

E.P.: I also thought that, you found the methods proposed by Kaczynski at the third and fourth chapter of *Anti-Tech Revolution* more or less useless for the task of destroying techno-industrial system. But now I understand that your position on this issue is like that Spanish saying you have mentioned in your mail: "Si no hay más, contigo Tomás." Am I wrong?

U.R.: You are not totally wrong, but you are not right either. What I have said is only that if a means is necessary for attaining one's goal (or for attaining the means necessary for achieving this goal), and there are no other alternative means, one has to use it. I was not speaking there about efficiency, because speaking of efficiency in this case is pointless. Of course it is implicit that if a means is necessary for attaining a goal, it is minimally useful or efficient. But to be necessary doesn't mean inevitably to be the *most* effective.

On the other hand, one thing is to consider necessary to act "politically" on the structure (to create a movement, to attain power and influence, to take over social organizational structures like the state, etc.) in order to eventually be able to access to the means to physically destroy the technoindustrial system (that is, to destroy its infra-structure), and other to get the takeover of social structure ("social order") mixed up with the destruction of social infra-structure (society's material base), and thus, of the whole society that depends on it. I would choose "Tomás" (the takeover of the state structure) only as a necessary means to get enough power or resources to *eventually* destroy the technoindustrial system, but not as a means efficient for *directly* destroying technoindustrial society or as a goal in itself.

E.P.: I think, it can't be said that past revolutions were truly popular. And it seems to me also one of the reasons why Kaczynski looks up as an inspiration to past revolutions, especially the Bolsheviks. See for example pages 145-47[15] of *Anti-Tech Revolution*. Bolsheviks were a tiny minority until the cataclysmic events of 1917. Maybe they tried to be popular but they were not. They were an organized and dedicated minority. When the uprising began at October, most of the population was not Bolshevik. (Even the politicized strata). But at that point there wasn't a better organized and dedicated group. With the help of their organizational power and unwavering dedication, Bolsheviks were able to manipulate the masses. These people probably didn't know what they were doing, what was the Bolsheviks' aim. Their main motivational factor was anger, hate and frustration. So this popularity issue also seems to me is not a very strong differentiative factor between old revolutions and a movement against techno-industrial society.

U.R.: Maybe Bolshevism was not much popular at its beginning, but its principles and goals were always greatly popular ones, or at least *deep down* quite similar, compatible or adjustable to popular ones. So they already were potentially popular. And precisely because of this trait, i.e., greatly socially acceptable values and ends, greatly popular and conventional principles and goals, they ended attaining mass support. Yes, their discipline, organizational skills and dedication to their cause, and the anger of the infuriated insurgent masses were important factors too, among others, but without some shared values and goals with the masses, they probably couldn't have had so much success in manipulating them. Not at least for much time; not for enough time to attain power and make their revolution. Anger and rage are strong but not durable motivations for action. Generally, in most people, once anger is vented, it tends to disappear and stops working as a motivation. It is like gunpowder, it burns, but too quickly. If you want to maintain the fire more time you need some other more durable fuel. Gunpowder can serve to make other fuels to catch fire, but it alone can't last much. One can use gunpowder to start a more durable fire if he is skilful enough (like were Bolsheviks in 1917) and knows how to use and take advantage from the surrounding extant fuels. But it is only a fire-starter, at most. To maintain mass motivation a movement needs, amongst other things, also positive ideals, promises of a better future, images of a better world or society, and the like. And all these were quite popular in the case of Bolshevism, because they were inspired in popular values like equality, sharing, etc. And, conversely, the ideal of a movement against technoindustrial society (and the values that inspire it) can't be popular (unless the movement lies –to people and to itself- and makes up its ideal to make it appear much more pleasant and socially acceptable than it really is). The promise of a movement truly against technoindustrial society for the shake of wild Nature isn't a utopian Garden of Eden, only the real world with real people with all its discomfort, problems, violence, disease, abuse, pain and death, though without modern technology. In principle, this will be a not much appealing ideal; it will be a harsh and sour world in the eyes of most modern people, and they won't embrace it easily. Unless, as I have pointed out, it is turned dishonestly into a sweeter but false ideal. This is what occurs, for example, in the case of primitivism and their utopian primitive past and "primitive future."

---

[15] Pages 210-14 in Soregra's edition, and pages 177-80 in Publit Soluções Editoriais' edition.

Maybe at some point, such kind of "popular" deceits could be seen as necessary for manipulating masses in order to attain the goal of destroying the tecnoindustrial system, but in principle, it is better to avoid them and act as honestly as possible, for several practical reasons (e.g.,, to avoid becoming a constructive movement or to repel undesirable people and to attract, or at least not to repel, high quality people and even to gain and maintain their respect toward the movement.)

E.P.: But there might be more important distinctions between these two movements. For example, at the last paragraph of point 10 (page 147[16], *Anti-Tech Revolution*, Fitch & Madison) it is stated: "It is important to notice that the crucial events of the Russian Revolution took place in St. Petersburg. This was true of the spontaneous insurrection of the February 1917 and also of the Bolsheviks' seizure of power the following October. Thus Bolsheviks were able to concentrate their efforts on a single city, once they had won in St. Petersburg the rest of the country were relatively easy. This shows how victory at the single most critical point can provide a basis for the assumption of power throughout an entire society – further reason why it is possible for a numerically small revolutionary movement to prevail." Is there a most critical point for a movement against techno-industrial society? Where is that point? What is it? That is why I defined destroying the techno-industrial system as a technical problem. Defining it as such doesn't necessarily mean that "it will be something as simple as merely to use directly an easily available and usable means to solve a technical problem." In fact, in current society, technical problems tend to be very complex. A single individual or a group of individuals, however technically competent they are, can't understand the totality of interacting factors. Destroying techno-industrial society might be the most complex technical problem ever. But perhaps there is a critical point that can be aimed, and if someone hits it, techno-industrial society will collapse like a house of cards. But I don't know, because I am not technically competent. When I look at the technical aspect of the matter, it seems to me that people who will undertake the destruction of techno-industrial society need to be very technically competent, at least at the same level as they need to be competent politically, if not more.

---

[16] Page 214 in Soregra's edition, and pages 180-81 in Publit Soluções Editoriais' edition.

U.R.: I think that the difference here is not the existence or non-existence of critical points, but the critical points themselves and the results of focusing on them. For the Bolsheviks to concentrate their efforts on Saint Petersburg resulted on attaining enough power (changes in structure) to, thereafter, *begin* their revolution in whole Russia. They didn't focus their action on St. Petersburg and, automatically and immediately, their revolution was just completed and finished. It only was the beginning. In the case of a movement against technoindustrial society for the sake of wild Nature, actual critical points refer to points which one could concentrate his efforts on and the whole system would fall down (or at least, points where those efforts would greatly weaken it so that it could be destroyed easily with one or few more blows), and not points on which acting would give power or resources to the movement. The power and the resources should have been attained previously.

Anyway, there could be some of those critical points and, as long as I know, all of them are part of the infra-structure. I am not a technician expert either, but I think that there could be some "weak" points or "bottleneck" points that, if hit skilfully and at the appropriate moment (e.g., during a crisis that weakens and disturbs seriously technoindustrial society), could make the technoindustrial system to fall apart or greatly weaken. As I said above, the elements that constitute a complex system don't interact equally or disorderly, they interact following a hierarchy and an order and not all elements or interactions are equally important. And this is precisely what could make possible the destruction of the system by choosing those elements and interactions that are both important and vulnerable, and acting on them. Kaczynski mentioned some of them in "Hit Where It Hurts"[17], but he did it so vaguely and roughly that I'm afraid that this text alone won't be of much help to choose any concrete, adequate targets. For example, to speak about electrical grid is not enough. But electrical grid has weak and simultaneously important points that could be good targets at some point. In fact, all grids or nets, not only the electrical one, have this kind of points. They are not homogeneous nets in which all knots (or nodes) are equally important and regularly laid out. There are some knots/nodes in which interactions are more abundant, in which fluxes concentrate, through which all or most the things transported through the grid (electricity, gas, oil, data, commodities, etc.) have to pass, etc. And those knots/nodes tend to be relatively few. And, then, at least some of those knots/nodes maybe could be good targets for a movement against technoindustrial society. Of course, I am not speaking here about *sporadic attacks on a small scale*, but rather about *organized and massive destruction* of those knots.

And, at the same time, one should remember that demography is also part of infra-structure, and so, necessary for maintaining technoindustrial society. *For the moment,* modern society depends on the existence of great numbers of people, as consumers and labourers, and its technological system can't survive if demography falls too much (and I'm speaking of quite "too much": several billions) and too suddenly. I'm speaking of massive and quick population destruction. This could be another point on which the movement could act if, at some point, it were possible.

---

[17] *Technological Slavery*, Feral House, 2010, pages 246-253.

In fact, the destruction of the technoindustrial society would only be effective in preserving what is left of wild Nature if it were accompanied by a drastic and rapid demographic reduction (of many billions). If the technoindustrial system falls apart without a fast (that is, virtually simultaneous) and huge decrease in human population, the billions of survivors left would destroy the remaining Nature even more, mainly by trying desperately to obtain food and fuel by non-industrial methods, like hunting or cutting down forests, respectively. Maybe many of them would end dying of starvation or diseases some time later anyway, but by then they could have virtually devastated the Earth.

Likewise, another part of society's infra-structure is its ecology (the society's physical relationships with ecosystems). If you destroy the ecosystems on which technoindustrial society depends, you destroy technoindustrial society too. If biosphere is disrupted enough, then the technoindustrial system, which at least for the moment depends still greatly on human beings and thus on a minimally liveable and healthy natural environment for maintaining them alive and minimally healthy, would certainly fall down. But then the extant remaining Nature (which is what one wanted to preserve ultimately through destroying technoindustrial society) would have fallen down with it.

Therefore, this means that not every way of effectively destroying the technoindustrial system would be equally desirable for a movement whose main value is wild Nature. Some ways would imply an inescapable huge destruction of remaining wilderness, and so, they should be avoided. And this adds another degree of difficulty to the already difficult task of getting rid of modern technology.

Finally, a correction: destroying technoindustrial society, though can be a very complex technical problem, is not the most complex technical problem ever. For example, to reform or remodel technoindustrial society (or to build other utopian society from its remains), in order to make it function *utterly* "well", that is, not only without the extant problems that plague it now, but also without any further unforeseen problems, would be a much more complex technical problem (impossible to solve in fact).

E.P.: Also there won't be a single city (like the St. Petersburg of point 10, page 147[18] in *Anti-Tech Revolution*) in which all the important happenings will take place. The movement against techno-industrial system needs to be an international, world-wide event.

U.R.: Yes, in my opinion, this is not only a big difference from past revolutionary movements, but I could be also a big obstacle for the actual destruction of the technoindustrial system. It probably would add even more difficulty to this already very difficult task.

E.P.: At point 11 (*Anti-Tech Revolution*, page 148[19]), there is a summary of the probable pattern for a revolution against techno-industrial system. This pattern is very similar to what happened at French and Russian revolutions. Though, at the French case, there wasn't a cohesive cadre of committed, hard core revolutionaries. French Revolution was more of successive levels of more and more radicalization triggered by some domestic and foreign happenings than a revolution against a current social order planned, initiated and implemented by an organization. This committed and hard-core revolutionaries remain as a very small minority until some kind of a cataclysmic event. I think this point is very important for Kaczynski. Because, if there is no such an event that would disrupt sufficiently the functioning of the system, revolutionaries are more or less helpless. (They can try to stimulate a similar crisis but normally they will be too weak until system enters a crisis with its own dynamics.) In absence of this cataclysmic event, the system is too powerful. (See page 267[20] of *Technological Slavery*, "As matters stand at the moment, revolution in the stable parts of the industrialized world is impossible. A revolution could occur only if something happened to shake the stability of industrial society.") Apart from the weakening of the established authorities, cataclysmic event will also provide to the movement the support of the population. (This support defined as: "the active support only of some fairly small minority of the population.") Great majority is not in the equation, because they will be hopeless, apathetic and disorganized.

---

[18] Page 214 in Soregra's edition, and pages 180-81 in Publit Soluções Editoriais' edition.

[19] Pages 214-15 in Soregra's edition, and pages 181-82 in Publit Soluções Editoriais' edition.

I see a problem with this cataclysmic event scenario. Cataclysmic event most probably will not be a one big hollywoodesque Day of Judgment event that will hinder the functioning of the system with one blow. It will, perhaps, consist of successive but not very large events, affecting only some part of the population without weakening the technological capabilities of the system, and making the people more apathetic and too weak to do anything. They will be thrown out of the system, unable to do anything, with no knowledge and material, technical resources to achieve anything. With a continuous deterioration (without a one big awakening blow) we might face a situation where earth's capacity of sustaining biological life is destroyed or human beings are turned into something different as we conventionally call humans. I don't think also there is so much time until we reach to these possibilities. Perhaps most of the road has been cleared?

U.R.: Well, regarding the "cataclysmic event", or the "serious crisis" as Kaczynski usually calls it, as long as I know he has never said it will be necessarily a mere one "big event or blow" (in case that it will happen at all). Furthermore, I don't think that if this crisis were not only one "big event" it would imply actually a big problem for an already prepared and organized movement which had *previously* acquired enough strength, power and resources. In any case, population's *active* support probably wouldn't be so important. And even though then most people were gradually made more apathetic and too weak to do anything (and when aren't most people apathetic and useless to do anything important?), probably there always would be left a small diehard minority who could actively support the movement anyway.

Regarding to face a situation where Earth's capacity of sustaining biological life is destroyed or human beings are turned into something different as we conventionally call humans, well, I would like to make some qualifications.

First of all, I think it is still a long way left to reach *exactly* those situations. Moreover, it is quite possible that they will never occur *utterly*.

Life is tough; it is not easy to eliminate it *completely*. The actual threat is rather that wild ecosystems can be completely eliminated or subjugated, transforming Earth into a garden, a big city or an industrial wasteland (or some intermediate mix of the three). Another real menace is that many vulnerable species can disappear, diminishing, weakening and simplifying ecosystems. Another (though less probable) threat is that the conditions in which any big and medium sized living being can live end being so deteriorated that it won't be possible for them to survive. Of course, we (and many other big animals and plants) won't survive in this last situation. But life virtually always will survive in the form of microscopic organisms and other resistant little living beings. Life is not threatened, what is threatened is the wildness of ecosystems and the existence of many big species (probably ours included).

---

[20] Or page 140 in the Fitch & Madison edition.

And regarding to turn human beings into something different from what we have called humans until now (I suppose that you are referring to cyborgs, robots, loaded minds in computers, genetically modified individuals; or to any mix of some of these possibilities), I think that although it probably won't be successfully and utterly attained ever, it can and probably would be gradually tried and developed (it has already being tried and developed to some extent) and the consequences probably will be disastrous anyway. Not only because, even if it is never attained completely, it will affect negatively the wild character and expression of our nature (that is, its natural -non-artificial- and autonomous character and expression), our *real* freedom, making "people" (or whatever they actually are then) more and more dependent on the technoindustrial system, and thus more and more alien to wild Nature; but also because this process of development surely will have lots of unexpected (and bad) consequences for wild ecosystems and wild non-human species, for society and culture, for values and morality, etc. It will add more and more artificial complexity, disorder, confusion, madness, helplessness and blurring of traditional and natural limits and references for human life, disturbing and spoiling more and more of what has usually been regarded valuable till now.

E.P.: In your critique you say: "The means and ways used for attaining certain ends tend to be dependent on the very ends pursued. The tools used to carry out some kind of concrete task tend to be specific to carry out that task, they have been designed and created for it and usually they don't serve to carry out other tasks. Certainly, there are 'general' or 'broad use' tools that serve to carry out different tasks, but their efficiency (the precision and quality of the results and the simplicity and comfort of their use) when carrying out each of the different concrete tasks for which they are used tends to be less than that of other tools more specific for each task. Tools' efficiency is in inverse proportion to the number of tasks they can be used for."

You say here that specific tools are more efficient than general or widely used tools. Kaczynski is proposing a "tool" (if we can call the proposed organizational structure, strategies and tactics at the third and fourth chapter of *Anti-Tech Revolution* a tool or tools) or methods that are gathered from previous revolutionary struggles and organizations. This means that these methods/tools have been used on different occasions in the past and can be used now for the task of destructing technoindustrial society. For this reason it is not a specific tool, more like a "general" or "widely used" tool. Don't you criticize at this point, that he gathered a method/tool from past examples of revolutionary struggles?

U.R.: First, what makes a tool to belong to the kinds "general" or "specific" are the purposes it is designed for, not the purposes one tries to use it for. You can try to use a fork to eat soup, to paint the wall or to write a letter, but this won't make it a "general use" tool. It only will make you look like an idiot.

And second, no, I was not criticizing exactly the fact "that he gathered a method/tool from past examples of revolutionary struggles". As I have already said, what I criticized was that Kaczynski is defending to study and taking as reference some means and ways that were specifically developed by people whose values, and thus goals, were very different from those that should have a movement against the technoindustrial system for the sake of wild Nature. And therefore, those means were designed for attaining goals that were not the destruction of the infra-structure of technoindustrial society.

I didn't say that those means were "tools" either, much less that they were neither "broad use" nor "specific use" tools. I only used the example of tools to show how goals determine the choosing of the means used to attain them, and given that goals are in turn determined by values, values determine the kind of means used. So to take as reference of means to use those means designed for attaining quite different goals from ours, probably won't work well.

But, since you call those means "tools" and speak about their "general" or "specific" character, I will say again that I don't know and I don't mind if they are (like) "multipurpose" tools or (like) "specific use" tools. If they are (like) "specific" tools, they simply won't work, because the purpose Kaczynski proposes to use them is very different from that they were designed for. If they are "broad use" tools, they can work, but it would be better (more efficient) to use some other more "specific" tool specially designed for the present task, if possible. Maybe the tool could be altered and fixed to make it more "specific" for the present task, but this probably would be similar to (and maybe more difficult than) designing a new tool from the beginning without taking others as reference (see footnote 9 of my critique).

E.P.: You have said above: "Anyway, as I said in 'Basic requirements for creating an efficient movement against technoindustrial system' and in point 6 of my critique, if actually there is not even a movement (still?), all this is mere speculation and it isn't worth expanding deeper on this issue."

You are right that, "discussing how to organize to achieve sufficient power (understood as technical, economic and human resources) to destroy the techno-industrial system without having previously met capable and willing people is mere speculation." But it is not idle speculation. Because, without having a basic agreement on the issues such as: what the movement should be like, what should be its strategy and tactics and whether the proposed mission is an achievable one; meeting with people to organize would be idle indeed.

U.R.: No, it is not idle or useless speculation, but *beyond some point*, it is speculation anyway. And, in any case, where are the people with whom to attain a basic agreement on these issues to organize?

Moreover, some of these issues, or at least some of their details, cannot and should not be deepened either publicly or openly; or before there is enough suitable people to organize with. Otherwise, not only it will indeed be idle speculation, but even it could be counterproductive, promoting rush and helping or encouraging fools and undesirables to organize and to act themselves in stupid ways.

Note: The above is just a theoretical exercise of discussion about the hypothetical possibilities that a non-leftist movement which is really contrary to technoindustrial society for the sake of wild Nature emerges and may end up opting to destroy the techno-industrial system, as well as about what methods this movement could use to achieve its goal. *At no time this discussion is really intended to incite conspiracy, to encourage other people to carry out massive attacks against techno-industrial infrastructure or the killing of billions of people*. If any reader misunderstood the previous discussion and decided to carry out any of the activities discussed above, he would be doing so exclusively on his own responsibility. *Último Reducto does not advocate any form of illegal activity*. U.R. does not adopt this policy because he morally rejects violence or respects current legality, but merely for practical reasons, as part of his strategy (that is, to avoid legal problems).

© 2019, Último Reducto for U.R.'s answers.